

**BUSINESS CARDS.**

**Mr. A. A. Lull,**  
TEACHER OF THE  
**PIANO FORTE & ORGAN,**  
At Mr. Zerth Lull's, Central Street,  
Woodstock, May 13, 1844. 209-6w

**O. A. BRYANT,**  
Dealer in English, French, and American Dry Goods,  
W. I. Goods, and Groceries,  
Crockery, Glass and Hard Ware,  
Elm Street.

**JONAS G. TRIBUNE,**  
SUCCESSOR TO ALBERT KING;  
DEALER IN FLOUR, W. I. GOODS AND GROCERIES,  
CONFECTIONARY, SUMMER DRINKS, AND  
REFRESHMENTS, CONSTANTLY ON HAND.  
CENTRAL STREET.

**MELLISH & SLADE,**  
DEALERS IN FLOUR, W. I. GOODS & GROCERIES,  
FRUITS, CONFECTIONARY, SUMMER DRINKS AND  
REFRESHMENTS.  
CENTRAL STREET, OPPOSITE WHITE'S HOTEL,  
GEO. MELLISH, 600, H. SLADE.

**RUSSELL & CLARK,**  
W. A. TCHMAKERS AND JEWELLERS,  
OPPOSITE WHITE'S HOTEL, CENTRAL STREET.

**R. H. BAILEY,**  
Manufacturer of Silks, Satins and Spectacles, and Dealer  
in Jewelry, Cutlery and Fancy Goods.  
Wholesale and Retail, 209  
Opposite White's Hotel, Central Street.

**HENRY HATCH,**  
One door south of Union Hall, Elm Street,  
TIN, COPPER, AND SHEET IRON WORKER.

**BOOT & SHOE MANUFACTORY,**  
JOEL EATON,  
Central Street.

**THOMAS B. WINN,**  
TAILOR,  
Same door with N. Randall.

**MICHAEL MYERS,**  
Over J. C. Allen & Co's Office,  
Elm Street.

**E. W. SMITH, Tailor,**  
Over F. C. Robinson's Boot and Shoe House,  
LUDLOW, VT. 128

**WHITNEY'S HOTEL,**  
Corner of Elm and Central streets,  
BY S. WHITNEY.

**EAGLE HOTEL,**  
BY P. G. ALDEN,  
Corner of North and Green Streets.

**HENRY T. MARSH,**  
House and Sign Painter, also Dealer in Carriages,  
and Various kinds of every description,  
CENTRAL STREET.

**WITT & SCOTT,**  
Painters, and Dealers in Chairs and Carriages of all kinds,  
CENTRAL STREET.

**JOSHUA MITCHELL,**  
CARRIAGE & SLEIGH-MAKER,  
HIGGINS STREET, 116

**I. M. & G. FISHER,**  
Manufacturers of and Dealers in cabinet furniture of  
every description,  
Central Street.

**D. B. R. PALMER,**  
Office in the Brick Block opposite Whitney's,  
CENTRAL STREET.

**S. J. ALLEN, M. D.,**  
**PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,**  
Office opposite Whitney's Hotel.

**B. H. KIMBALL,**  
Blacksmith,  
SUCCESSOR TO LORENZO PRATT,  
"ROUND THE CORNER," HIGH STREET.

**R. O'HARA,**  
BLACK-SMITH,  
Central Street.

**LIVERY STABLE,**  
BY ALBERT PACKER,  
Court Street.

**COLLIER & BARRETT,**  
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,  
Elm Street, 183

**JACOB COLLIER,** JAMES BARRETT

**O. P. CHANDLER & E. H. BILINGS,**  
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,  
Central Street.

**TRACY & CONVERSE,**  
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,  
Office over the Bank, Elm Street.

**L. A. MARSH,**  
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
Central Street.

**STOUGHTON & PIERSON,**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW,  
Chesler, Pl. 86

**H. E. STOUGHTON,** I. B. PIERSON.

Residences:—His Excellency H. Hubbard, Charleston,  
N. H.; Hon. Edmund Burke, Newport, N. H.;  
Nath'l Follen, Esq., Chester, Vt.;  
Chas. Edmund, Esq.,  
George W. Lewis, Esq.,  
Messrs Hudson, Carter & Co., Boston, Ms.;  
J. Danforth & Son,

**THOS. BARTLETT, JR. & CHARLES R. FLETCHER**  
Attorneys, Counsellors and Solicitors in Chancery,  
AT NEWPORT, Vt.

**AT AND THE SOUTHERN COURTS OF THE COUNTIES OF CAL-  
DOWN, ROSS, ORANGE AND WASHINGTON, 133-41**

**BLODGETT & WEYMOUTH,**  
**ATTORNEYS AT LAW,**  
Bellef, Vt. 203

**D. C. BLODGETT,** D. F. WEYMOUTH.

**HUNTON & JONES,**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW,  
Chesler, Pl. 203

**A. P. HUNTON,** P. C. JONES.

**J. SARGANT,**  
Attorney and Counsellor at Law  
(Main Street),  
WINDSOR, VT.

**S. R. STREETER,**  
Attorney and Counsellor at Law,  
BARNARD, VT. 113

**J. Q. HAWKINS,**  
Attorney and Counsellor at Law,  
FELLSVILLE, VT. 94

**SALMON WILKS,**  
**ATTORNEY & COUNSELLOR AT LAW,**  
JOHNSON, VT.

**J. F. DEANE,**  
Attorney and Counsellor at Law,  
CAVENDISH, VT. 105

**SAMUEL H. PRICE,**  
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
WINDSOR, VT. 99-13

**RICHARDSON & NICHOLSON,**  
Attorneys, and Counsellors at Law,  
Chesler, Windsor County, Vt.  
N. RICHARDSON, 86 A. A. NICHOLSON.

**SEWALL, FULLAM,**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
LUDLOW, VT. 181-13

**FREDERICK C. ROBBINS,**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
LUDLOW, VT. 157-13

**WALKER & SLADE,**  
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,  
ROYALTON, VT. 125-41

**R. WALKER,** S. W. SLADE.

**DRS. PAIGE & PALMER,**  
**PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS,**  
May be found at their respective places of residence,  
BETHEL, VT. 126-13.

**DARTMOUTH HOTEL,**  
BY PARKER MORSE,  
HANOVER, N. H. 86

**BRICK STAGE HOUSE,**  
SOUTH SIDE BLACK RIVER,

**JOHN K. SMITH,**  
LUDLOW, VT. 161 if

**WEST RUTLAND TEMPERANCE HOUSE,**  
BY WILLIAM R. CLEMENT, 197-6m

**JAMES TALLANT,**  
DEALER IN  
WEST INDIA GOODS AND FAMILY GROCERIES,  
Choice Wines and Liquors,  
**GRANVILLE,**  
ONE DOOR SOUTH OF THE PRINCE HOTEL,  
CONCORD, N. H. 176-14

Winter stationed at the best of the best  
ways on hand, at RETAIL, or by the BARREL.

**AGUSTUS HAVEN,**  
Wholesale and retail dealer in W. I. Goods, Tea, Fruits,  
Wines, &c., also, Stoves, Furniture, &c.,  
30 BROAD STREET, OF ST. GEORGE'S,  
Montpelier, Vt. 192 13

**C. W. HUBBARD,**  
Wholesale and retail Confectioner  
Montpelier Vt. 192 13

WOODSTOCK

# The Age.

Freedom of Inquiry and the Power of the People.

VOLUME V. WOODSTOCK, THURSDAY EVENING, JUNE 27, 1844. NUMBER 215.

## THE AGE.

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1844.

**HENRY CLAY, AND A NATIONAL BANK.**  
Mr. Clay, in a public speech at Macon, Ga., said:  
"He was in favor of a BANK OF THE UNITED STATES. All nations give us the example."  
Again, Mr. Clay, at Charleston, S. C., was equally explicit. The Courier, the Whig organ in that city, in noticing his speech, said:  
"Mr. Clay assumed that Banks and the Banking system would continue to exist under the auspices of the States, and thence inferred the necessity of a NATIONAL BANK TO REGULATE AND CONTROL the system, and keep it from explosion and mischief. He also insisted on a National Bank as necessary to secure a National Currency, &c."

**JAMES K. POLK, AND A NATIONAL BANK.**  
An attempt to declare my solemn conviction that the Federal Government possesses NO CONSTITUTIONAL POWER to incorporate a National Bank.—Inaugural Address, delivered at Nashville, Oct. 24, 1820.

**GEO. M. DALLAS, & A NATIONAL BANK.**  
"It would be IMPOSSIBLE that I should by any official action, and in the establishment of another UNITED STATES BANK."—Letter to Hon. John W. Foster, dated Philadelphia, June 8, 1844.

**Read! Read!!**  
**COL. POLK AND PROTECTION.**  
The following from the Albany Argus sets Col. Polk right before the people on the subject of Protection:

The whigs are taken so completely aback by the nomination of Gov. Polk, that they have already resorted to falsehood—the last kick of despair. They boldly assert that Gov. Polk is in favor of free trade and against all protection to American industry. To prove this they have already taken garbled extracts from his speech which he delivered in the House of Representatives in January 1833. Here is an extract from that speech which will effectually silence all these slanders:

"NO MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE (OF WHICH HE WAS ONE) WHO YIELDED HIS ASSENT TO THIS BILL, I MAY SAFELY AFFIRM, DESIRES TO PROSTRATE THE MANUFACTURER, NOR WILL SUCH, IN THEIR JUDGMENT BE THE EFFECT OF THE BILL. I VENTURE TO AFFIRM THAT THE BILL, SO FAR FROM PROSTRATING THESE ESTABLISHMENTS, AFFORDS SUFFICIENT PROTECTION TO ALL SUCH AS ARE BASED ON REAL, NOT BORROWED, CAPITAL, AND WHICH ARE CONDUCTED WITH ECONOMY AND SKILL, NOT ONLY TO STAND UNDER THE BURDEN OF PROTECTION, BUT TO REALIZE GREATER RATES OF PROFIT, UPON THE CAPITAL AND LABOR EMPLOYED, THAN IS DERIVED FROM ANY OTHER REGULAR BUSINESS IN THE COUNTRY."

It will be perceived that so far from denying protection, he advocates a bill giving ample protection to the manufacturing interests.

The truth lies in a nutshell. Gov. Polk is in favor of moderate duties, because thus only can stability be secured. Manufacturers want steadiness in the laws, and then there is no fear but what they will flourish in this country. But from the nature of our People, it is impossible for them to acquiesce in a system of high duties, and as a consequence, at every election the tariff becomes the foot-ball of politicians. Is this state of things desirable? Is it not better to have the tariff settled by mutual compromise and agreement, and then to remain as stable as the constitution of our country? Would not the manufacturer and the laborer be thus alike benefited?

If the tariff is once settled on acknowledged principles of justice and impartiality, there can be no fear of a change. It must stand, because it rests upon justice. We may say of justice as of truth, "The eternal years of God are hers."

We would ask Americans, without distinction of party, if the ground taken by Gov. Polk on this vexed question is not the true and statesmanlike policy. Neither is it sectional. It would harmonize the somewhat conflicting interests of our widely extended confederacy, and make the People of every state feel that they were ruled not only by a beneficent but a just system. A feeling like this, would be not only a bond of happy and enduring union among the states, but of steady and wide-spread prosperity among the People.

**ENTHUSIASM OF THE PEOPLE!—**  
**CLEAR THE TRACK FOR YOUNG HICKORY!**  
Get out of the way—the country rallies! Clear the track for Polk and Dallas!

**ENTHUSIASM OF THE DEMOCRACY!**

Henry Clay is a doomed man. A degree of enthusiasm exists among the democracy never before witnessed. As soon as the nomination was announced in Baltimore, a national salute was fired on Federal Hill, with the piece taken from the British by General Washington at the battle of Princeton, in 1777. Another salute of 100 guns was fired in the Park, New York City, with a piece taken by General Montgomery at St. Johns in 1775, and another of 100 guns at Albany with one of the pieces taken from Burgoyne by Gates at Saratoga.

These pieces are interesting relics of our Revolutionary struggle. They once belonged to the famous Duke of Marlborough, and were at the celebrated battle of Blenheim, where, as the poet Laureate of Great Britain says:

"Great deeds the Duke of Marlborough won,  
On that eventful day."  
From Maine to Texas, the thunders of Democracy are heard, and its roar will not cease till "hope shall be swallowed up in victory!"—Plain Dealer.

**RATIFICATION MEETINGS IN N. HAMPSHIRE.**—On the reception of the news of the nomination of James K. Polk, A Na-

tional salute was fired by the democrats of Portsmouth, N. H. The nomination met with universal acceptance, and a new spirit was infused into the democratic ranks which will manifest itself in November next by giving an overwhelming majority for Polk and Dallas. The union which prevailed, (says the Mercury,) at the close of the Convention, struck the whigs in this vicinity with terror and dismay, and they now have but faint hopes of electing Mr. Clay.

**THE GREAT RATIFICATION MEETING AT CONCORD, N. H.** We are informed, was attended by at least three thousand people. The assemblage was addressed from a stand in the area of the State House by several gentlemen; among others the Hon. George Bancroft, the eminent historian and distinguished politician, who spoke with the greatest force and eloquence of diction for upwards of an hour. The nominations are received in New Hampshire with the utmost harmony and enthusiasm, a precursor to a glorious victory to the Democracy.

**DEMOCRATIC VICTORY IN CANANDAIGUA!**  
FIRST GUN FOR POLK AND DALLAS!  
*The Cabin Blown up and the Corn Floor.*

Yesterday was our charter election. We have polled the largest vote ever taken in this place, and have the gratification of announcing a victory in favor of the Democracy, and an utter overthrow of Federalism and Clay Cabins! The number of votes is 469, and the democratic majority runs from five to forty-three! an average of thirteen! In 1830, the whig majority was from 6 to 3.

Every exertion was made by the Federalists to come off victorious at this contest, and they went so far as to appoint a committee, on Monday evening to convey the news of the anticipated triumph to the Convention to be held in Utica on the 5th inst.; but defeat has met that committee in their presumptions, and bid them "stay at home where they belong!" Banks, Duels and Cards are too weighty to contend with the enthusiasm which rages among the people in favor of the "Young Hickory." The people have got at the true issue, and Federalism is, consequently, defeated. We have never seen greater good feeling among our friends, or greater gloom and despondency among our enemies, than now. The first gun has been effective, and it will be followed by more successful shots. Remember that.—Ontario Messenger.

**RATIFICATION MEETING IN DETROIT.**—The Democratic Association of Detroit, met on the 3d inst. to respond to the nomination made at Baltimore. The Free Press says: after the nomination of the meeting, Anthony Ten Eyck, Esq. offered a series of resolutions, complimentary of the nominees of the Baltimore Convention, ratifying and pledging the Democracy of the city to give them their united, zealous and cordial support. The resolutions were received and subsequently passed by acclamation. After a few brief and spirited remarks by Mr. Ten Eyck he closed, by announcing to the meeting, the presence of our own distinguished fellow citizen Gen Lewis Cass. On this announcement three hearty cheers for Cass brought the war-worn veteran to the rostrum.

Gen. Cass said he had come here this evening to take part in the proceedings, to express his hearty concurrence in the nomination made by the Baltimore Convention, and to announce his determination faithfully to support it. The crisis through which the Democratic party had just passed, had served but the better to prove the integrity of its principles, and the internal strength of its cause. After many differences of opinion, differences, however, about men, and not about measures, the Convention had unanimously fallen upon a man irreproachable in private life, and who in various public stations, had given proof of great firmness and ability, of incorruptible integrity, and of a sincere devotion to those principles, which the Democratic party deem essential to the prosperity of our country, and the perpetuation of her free institutions. I know him well, said Gen. Cass, and I know he will fulfill the expectations of his friends, and fully justify the confidence of the party. Nothing now is wanting to ensure success,—but united exertion, and that we must and will have. Let us put behind us the divisions and preferences of the past, and join in one common effort, to promote the triumph of our cause. Victory is in our power, and let us attain it. Let every one feel, and fulfill his duty. I am so persuaded that such will be the general sentiment and action of the party, that I confidently predict that James K. Polk will be the next President of the United States, and if he is, I know he will follow in the footsteps of Washington, of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Jackson.

The General was frequently interrupted in the course of his remarks by the loud bursts of applause from all present.

During the afternoon of the day, 100 guns were fired in honor of the nominees, and as the thunder tones of the cannon spoke out the determined and joyous voice of the Democracy, while they unfurled their banner to the breeze, Federal-Clay-coonery stooped its ears, and heaved a deep drawn sigh, as she felt and saw the first nail driven and clinched into her coffin.

After the adjournment of the meeting, the company gathered in front of the dwelling of Gen. Cass, and gave three hearty cheers. The General came to the door and thanked them kindly, and told them to do their duty to the Democracy and their country by electing James K. Polk, their next President. The company with one voice, replied they would, and they will.

**THE SPIRIT IS RISING.**—The Richmond Enquirer says, we have never seen such enthusiasm in our ranks as at the present time. The Democratic flag which has been raised, is now waving in the breeze. Accessions pour in upon us on every side. The Whigs, although they affect confidence in Mr. Clay's success, are trembling in their shoes. The whole country is aroused, the "Fiery Cross now is lighted on every hill," and hundreds of warriors, who have been disaffected, are now rushing and anxious for the coming fight. We have some bold and fearless champions, who though estrayed for the time are now rallying under the banner of State Rights principles. Among these we may number many here, but we must acknowledge the palm to the Little Cockade. She has done nobly, Mr. K. Meade, the Whig Harrison Elector of 1840, has repudiated Mr. Clay and his heresies and Judge Gholson, of the same little town, has renounced the infamous course that the Whigs are pursuing. To our country friends we say, "be of good cheer," the day must and shall be ours.

**CONNECTICUT.**—The nomination at Baltimore takes like wild fire throughout Connecticut. Every thing looks propitious. The Democrats in that State have inscribed on their banner:

**POLK, THE YOUNG HICKORY, DALLAS AND VICTORY!**

This appropriate inscription should appear on the Democratic flags and banners all over the Union. Let it be passed round.

**RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN DAN-  
GER.**  
**THE CATHOLICS—NATIVE AME-  
RICANS—MOBS, BURNINGS, AND  
MURDERS.**

An effort appears to be making, with the view of virtually depriving that sect of Christians called Catholics, from enjoying the liberty which in this country is guaranteed by our Constitution and laws to all sects and all religions. What cannot be done by law, is attempted through falsehood, misled public opinion, and excited mobs.

With pain and indignation we have seen efforts, by misrepresentations most foul, to make the Catholics, as a sect, responsible for the late riots and murders in Philadelphia.

The New York Journal of Commerce, a politico-religious newspaper, on the 30th ultimo, contained an article with the following caption, viz:

"The Roman Catholic Murders in Philadelphia."

Beginning with an assumption that Roman Catholics were the murderers, the Journal goes on to sustain its position. It thus states the case, viz:

"The material facts are, that a political meeting of American citizens, convened for the purpose of discussing questions of public importance, was fired upon, several persons killed and wounded, the assembly broken up and driven from the ground, and the American flag under which they had assembled trampled under foot: that when, a few days after the meeting re-assembled for the same purpose, and under the same flag, a fire more deadly than the first was opened upon them from buildings in the neighborhood, looped-holed beforehand, and with the use of arms which from their number and character proved that the attacks had been planned deliberately, and by other persons besides those who were present at the time. This attack was resisted, and the houses from which it proceeded were set fire to, upon which an extensive conflagration ensued. The armed men were driven from their positions, and a mob was gathered which continued for several days, during which time two churches were burned, and other acts of violence committed upon property, but no lives taken. The men who composed the deliberative assembly were protestants and chiefly native-born citizens: the men who fired upon them were Roman Catholics, and chiefly, if not wholly, of foreign birth."

The Journal, we are compelled to say, misstates the facts, and arrives at a conclusion which the real facts show to be absurd if not wicked. That conclusion is, that "the attacks had been planned deliberately."

That a handful of Roman Catholics, in one of our great cities, should deliberately plan an attack on a protestant assemblage, implies not only a want of common sense, but of that instinct which teaches even the brute creation to regard their own personal safety. What, in the conception even of a child, must be the consequences of an attack by Catholics on Protestants, where the latter outnumber the former a hundred to one? What but the destruction of the Catholics themselves? What but the burning of their own houses, the destruction of their furniture and goods, and turning out their wives and children, to wander through the country homeless and starving? Does the Journal really believe the Catholics would deliberately enter upon a career of this sort with their senses about them, even if as depraved as its editors suppose them to be?

This is not all. Those who have read the accounts as to the commencement of the riot, cannot have forgotten that the presence of the natives in the market-house when the affray began, was itself purely accidental. They had met at some distance in an open lot, and had there commenced their proceedings, and retired to

the market-house only on account of a shower of rain. How, then, was it possible that an attack upon them at that time and place, could have been "planned deliberately?"

Equally unfair and imperfect is the account which the Journal gives of the second meeting. It was not "a few days after," but the very next day. The meeting collected first in the State House Yard and in spite of the remonstrances of their own discreet men, marched to the scene of the preceding day's encounter, bearing the flag, with an inscription intended to exasperate the people against the Catholics: "This is the flag which was trampled upon by the Irish Papists." What did they exhibit the flag for, but to excite the people? What did they go to the battle-ground for but to have another fight? There is much more reason for charging Protestants than Catholics with having "deliberately planned" the second attack. If the Catholics had, in the mean time, collected arms, and looped-holed their houses, it only shows that they did not mistake the intention of their adversaries. If I make a loophole in my house and load my gun for the purpose of shooting a ruffian who, I have good reason to believe, intends to burn it, and drive my wife and children out of doors, I do not deliberately plan an attack upon him. My house cannot go to seek him; and if he keeps away, he is in no danger. But if he approaches in a menacing manner with a firebrand in his hand, and I shoot him, my whole conduct, the loophole, loaded gun an all, are but accessories of self defence. If the Natives had remained in the State House Yard, or gone elsewhere, the loop-holed houses of the Catholics would not have followed to hunt them up. It is palpable that the natives went there for a fight; that their movement was "deliberately planned;" and that they are more responsible than the Catholics for the murders which ensued.

We have scarcely patience to read the following extract from the Journal's article viz:

"How utterly unconscious, then, of their own personal interests, must those foreign born citizens have been, who fired in Philadelphia upon a deliberative assembly; how unfit to participate in the affairs of free government; and how dangerous the leaders among them, whose views and designs are so at war with our free institutions, that they would excite to such violence beforehand, and justify it afterwards."

"How incomparably better, or rather less bad, was the conduct of the men and boys who composed the 'lawless mob.'—Lawless to a great extent they were; and yet evidently under the control of laws of which foreigners knew nothing. Life was sacred even with them. Their vengeance was all wreaked upon property. Here is the immeasurable difference between the two parties. The one deliberately murdered American citizens for assembling to deliberate; the other retaliated by burning churches. If the Romanists had triumphed in a resistless mob, there is every reason to believe that the streets of Philadelphia would have been red with gore. With the mob as it was, human life was sacred.—Such is the influence of Protestantism and the Bible upon those who in the smallest degree, feel their influence. Such the effect of Romanism upon those who are most thoroughly enslaved with its spirit. How full of blessings must the one system be, and how full of wretchedness the other, when both have free scope."

"Fired on a deliberative assembly!"—Why, it is notorious that the "deliberative assembly" commenced the violence, and probably the firing. "Life was sacred even with them!" Sacred! when they assailed the Irish with every species of missile—beat, fired upon, dragged them from their houses, and in some instances put them to death? "Deliberately murdered American citizens!" Why, there was nothing deliberate on either side in the first affray, and the second arose from the deliberate purpose of the Natives and their allies, to have another fight! Does not the Journal slander the Protestantism and the Bible when it assumes that their influence only permits men to destroy property, and burn houses and churches? A questionable compliment to its own religion it is, to admit that its influence permits men only to rob, plunder, burn and destroy!—"Full of blessing!" must such a system, indeed, be!

But the Journal justifies the Natives in all their murders, beatings, plunderings, and burnings! It says:

"From these scenes we turn with great satisfaction to contemplate the conduct of the American Republicans. By them the principles of American liberty were fully understood, and honorably illustrated.—They went to the ground in the first place conscious of their rights, and unconscious of the murderous spirit which hovered a round the place. When by violence they had been driven from the ground, and the American stars and stripes trodden under foot, it was necessary that they should lift that ensign from the trampling of alien feet, and maintain the great American right of free discussion against alien hearts and hands. They could not do less than return to the spot, and at all hazards, yes, at all hazards, assert and maintain the fundamental principles of American liberty. To hazard all consequences, was the only prudence in such a case. If Romanism had triumphed against liberty there, who should have restored the breach? Much as we regret and condemn the riotous scenes which followed, we approve most heartily of the conduct of the Am. Republicans. The less, after all, is not equal to the gain. Houses can be rebuilt; principles not so easily. The Am. Republicans did right, when, after the fury

had subsided, they went again to the spot, and in that very place where American citizens, had been shot down for daring to deliberate, and the American flag trodden under foot, re-assembled the same meeting, and under the guardianship of that flag deliberated in peace.

"The fundamental principles of American liberty were established in blood; they have been and must continue to be maintained at the same expense, whenever that sad alternative becomes necessary. When the assembly of American citizens were fired upon, they had a right to return the fire, and resort to any other measures necessary for their defence; and in the absence of the civil authorities, to do whatever self-defence required. They were neither by the civil nor the moral law, required to run away, nor to stand still and be shot. They possessed the right of self-defence as individuals and as a meeting, in the same manner and to the same extent to which they would have been possessed if any one of them had been attacked when alone. Even beyond that, they were bound to stand their ground, for American liberty was in their keeping. When the civil authorities arrived and took possession of the ground, American Republicans, in strict conformity with the laws, restrained their vengeance, and placing themselves under the control of the civil magistrates, denounced the rioters, and were foremost in putting them down. From the beginning to the end, the Am. Republicans acted nobly, illustrating the glorious principles of American liberty in every measure which they adopted. We may well be proud of them, as noble conductors with American Republicans in New York. It is perfectly safe to trust such men."

This defence of mobs and lawless violence, because the principal sufferers were Catholics, is worthy only of that age when fire and sword were the Whig's principal argument. Coming from an intelligent and unexcited source, it is it possible worse than the Mob itself. It indicates a cool and cruel bigotry which can look up on the tortures of the inquisition and the stake as God-service, and thinks it right to put down obnoxious opinions by confiscation, blows and death.

There runs through this article an evident design to render suspected and obnoxious the Catholic Clergy by imputing to them a horrible conspiracy against the lives of American citizens. What other construction can be put on the declaration, that the attacks were planned deliberately "by other persons than those who were present at the time?" How else can we construe the remark "how dangerous the leaders among them whose views and designs are so at war with our free institutions, that they would excite to such violence beforehand, and justify it afterwards?"

"How incomparably better, or rather less bad, was the conduct of the men and boys who composed the 'lawless mob.'—Lawless to a great extent they were; and yet evidently under the control of laws of which foreigners knew nothing. Life was sacred even with them. Their vengeance was all wreaked upon property. Here is the immeasurable difference between the two parties. The one deliberately murdered American citizens for assembling to deliberate; the other retaliated by burning churches. If the Romanists had triumphed in a resistless mob, there is every reason to believe that the streets of Philadelphia would have been red with gore. With the mob as it was, human life was sacred.—Such is the influence of Protestantism and the Bible upon those who in the smallest degree, feel their influence. Such the effect of Romanism upon those who are most thoroughly enslaved with its spirit. How full of blessings must the one system be, and how full of wretchedness the other, when both have free scope."

"Fired on a deliberative assembly!"—Why, it is notorious that the "deliberative assembly" commenced the violence, and probably the firing. "Life was sacred even with them!" Sacred! when they assailed the Irish with every species of missile—beat, fired upon, dragged them from their houses, and in some instances put them to death? "Deliberately murdered American citizens!" Why, there was nothing deliberate on either side in the first affray, and the second arose from the deliberate purpose of the Natives and their allies, to have another fight! Does not the Journal slander the Protestantism and the Bible when it assumes that their influence only permits men to destroy property, and burn houses and churches? A questionable compliment to its own religion it is, to admit that its influence permits men only to rob, plunder, burn and destroy!—"Full of blessing!" must such a system, indeed, be!

But the Journal justifies the Natives in all their murders, beatings, plunderings, and burnings! It says:

"From these scenes we turn with great satisfaction to contemplate the conduct of the American Republicans. By them the principles of American liberty were fully understood, and honorably illustrated.—They went to the ground in the first place conscious of their rights, and unconscious of the murderous spirit which hovered a round the place. When by violence they had been driven from the ground, and the American stars and stripes trodden under foot, it was necessary that they should lift that ensign from the trampling of alien feet, and maintain the great American right of free discussion against alien hearts and hands. They could not do less than return to the spot, and at all hazards, yes, at all hazards, assert and maintain the fundamental principles of American liberty. To hazard all consequences, was the only prudence in such a case. If Romanism had triumphed against liberty there, who should have restored the breach? Much as we regret and condemn the riotous scenes which followed, we approve most heartily of the conduct of the Am. Republicans. The less, after all, is not equal to the gain. Houses can be rebuilt; principles not so easily. The Am. Republicans did right, when, after the fury

had subsided, they went again to the spot, and in that very place where American citizens, had been shot down for daring to deliberate, and the American flag trodden under foot, re-assembled the same meeting, and under the guardianship of that flag deliberated in peace.

"The fundamental principles of American liberty were established in blood; they have been and must continue to be maintained at the same expense, whenever that sad alternative becomes necessary. When the assembly of American citizens were fired upon, they had a right to return the fire, and resort to any other measures necessary for their defence; and in the absence of the civil authorities, to do whatever self-defence required. They were neither by the civil nor the moral law, required to run away, nor to stand still and be shot. They possessed the right of self-defence as individuals and as a meeting, in the same manner and to the same extent to which they would have been possessed if any one of them had been attacked when alone. Even beyond that, they were bound to stand their ground, for American liberty was in their keeping. When the civil authorities arrived and took possession of the ground, American Republicans, in strict conformity with the laws, restrained their vengeance, and placing themselves under the control of the civil magistrates, denounced the rioters, and were foremost in putting them down. From the beginning to the end, the Am. Republicans acted nobly, illustrating the glorious principles of American liberty in every measure which they adopted. We may well be proud of them, as noble conductors with American Republicans in New York. It is perfectly safe to trust such men."

This defence of mobs and lawless violence, because the principal sufferers were Catholics, is worthy only of that age when fire and sword were the Whig's principal argument. Coming from an intelligent and unexcited source, it is it possible worse than the Mob itself. It indicates a cool and cruel bigotry which can look up on the tortures of the inquisition and the stake as God-service, and thinks it right to put down obnoxious opinions by confiscation, blows and death.

There runs through this article an evident design to render suspected and obnoxious the Catholic Clergy by imputing to them a horrible conspiracy against the lives of American citizens. What other construction can be put on the declaration, that the attacks were planned deliberately "by other persons than those who were present at the time?" How else can we construe the remark "how dangerous the leaders among them whose views and designs are so at war with our free institutions, that they would excite to such violence beforehand, and justify it afterwards?"

"How incomparably better, or rather less bad, was the conduct of the men and boys who composed the 'lawless mob.'—Lawless to a great extent they were; and yet evidently under the control of laws of which foreigners knew nothing. Life was sacred even with them. Their vengeance was all wreaked upon property. Here is the immeasurable difference between the two parties. The one deliberately murdered American citizens for assembling to deliberate; the other retaliated by burning churches. If the Romanists had triumphed in a resistless mob, there is every reason to believe that the streets of Philadelphia would have been red with gore. With the mob as it was, human life was sacred.—Such is the influence of Protestantism and the Bible upon those who in the smallest degree, feel their influence. Such the effect of Romanism upon those who are most thoroughly enslaved with its spirit. How full of blessings must the one system be, and how full of wretchedness the other, when both have free scope."

"Fired on a deliberative assembly!"—Why, it is notorious that the "deliberative assembly" commenced the violence, and probably the firing. "Life was sacred even with them!" Sacred! when they assailed the Irish with every species of missile—beat, fired upon, dragged them from their houses, and in some instances put them to death? "Deliberately murdered American citizens!" Why, there was nothing deliberate on either side in the first affray, and the second arose from the deliberate purpose of the Natives and their allies, to have another fight! Does not the Journal slander the Protestantism and the Bible when it assumes that their influence only permits men to destroy property, and burn houses and churches? A questionable compliment to its own religion it is, to admit that its influence permits men only to rob, plunder, burn and destroy!—"Full of blessing!" must such a system, indeed, be!

But the Journal justifies the Natives in all their murders, beatings, plunderings, and burnings! It says:

"From these scenes we turn with great satisfaction to contemplate the conduct of the American Republicans. By them the principles of American liberty were fully understood, and honorably illustrated.—They went to the ground in the first place conscious of their rights, and unconscious of the murderous spirit which hovered a round the place. When by violence they had been driven from the ground, and the American stars and stripes trodden under foot, it was necessary that they should lift that ensign from the trampling of alien feet, and maintain the great American right of free discussion against alien hearts and hands. They could not do less than return to the spot, and at all hazards, yes, at all hazards, assert and maintain the fundamental principles of American liberty. To hazard all consequences, was the only prudence in such a case. If Romanism had triumphed against liberty there, who should have restored the breach? Much as we regret and condemn the riotous scenes which followed, we approve most heartily of the conduct of the Am. Republicans. The less, after all, is not equal to the gain. Houses can be rebuilt; principles not so easily. The Am. Republicans did right, when, after the fury

had subsided, they went again to the spot, and in that very place where American citizens, had been shot down for daring to deliberate, and the American flag trodden under foot, re-assembled the same meeting, and under the guardianship of that flag deliberated in peace.

"The fundamental principles of American liberty were established in blood; they have been and must continue to be maintained at the same expense, whenever that sad alternative becomes necessary. When the assembly of American citizens were fired upon, they had a right to return the fire, and resort to any other measures necessary for their defence; and in the absence of the civil authorities, to do whatever self-defence required. They were neither by the civil nor the moral law, required to run away, nor to stand still and be shot. They possessed the right of self-defence as individuals and as a meeting, in the same manner and to the same extent to which they would have been possessed if any one of them had been attacked when alone. Even beyond that, they were bound to stand their ground, for American liberty was in their keeping. When the civil authorities arrived and took possession of the ground, American Republicans, in strict conformity with the laws, restrained their vengeance, and placing themselves under the control of the civil magistrates, denounced the rioters, and were foremost in putting them down. From the beginning to the end, the Am. Republicans acted nobly, illustrating the glorious principles of American liberty in every measure which they adopted. We may well be proud of them, as noble conductors with American Republicans in New York. It is perfectly safe to trust such men."

This defence of mobs and lawless violence, because the principal sufferers were Catholics, is worthy only of that age when fire and sword were the Whig's principal argument. Coming from an intelligent and unexcited source, it is it possible worse than the Mob itself. It indicates a cool and cruel bigotry which can look up on the tortures of the inquisition and the stake as God-service, and thinks it right to put down obnoxious opinions by confiscation, blows and death.

There runs through this article an evident design to render suspected and obnoxious the Catholic Clergy by imputing to them a horrible conspiracy against the lives of American citizens. What other construction can be put on the declaration, that the attacks were planned deliberately "by other persons than those who were present at the time?" How else can we construe the remark "how dangerous the leaders among them whose views and designs are so at war with our free institutions, that they would excite to such violence beforehand, and justify it afterwards?"

"How incomparably better, or rather less bad, was the conduct of the men and boys who composed the 'lawless mob.'—Lawless to a great extent they were; and yet evidently under the control of laws of which foreigners knew nothing. Life was sacred even with them. Their vengeance was all wreaked upon property. Here is the immeasurable difference between the two parties. The one deliberately murdered American citizens for assembling to deliberate; the other retaliated by burning churches. If the Romanists had triumphed in a resistless mob, there is every reason to believe that the streets of Philadelphia would have been red with gore. With the mob as it was, human life was sacred.—Such is the influence of Protestantism and the Bible upon those who in the smallest degree, feel their influence. Such the effect of Romanism upon those who are most thoroughly enslaved with its spirit. How full of blessings must the one system be, and how full of wretchedness the other, when both have free scope."

"Fired on a deliberative assembly!"—Why, it is notorious that the "deliberative assembly" commenced the violence, and probably the firing. "Life was sacred even with them!" Sacred! when they assailed the Irish with every species of missile—beat, fired upon, dragged them from their houses, and in some instances put them to death? "Deliberately murdered American citizens!" Why, there was nothing deliberate on either side in the first affray, and the second arose from the deliberate purpose of the Natives and their allies, to have another fight! Does not the Journal slander the Protestantism and the Bible when it assumes that their influence only permits men to destroy property, and burn houses and churches? A questionable compliment to its own religion it is, to admit that its influence permits men only to rob, plunder, burn and destroy!—"Full of blessing!" must such a system, indeed, be!